April 10, 2002

Ms. Deirdre Clark Fauquier County Department of Community Development 40 Culpeper Street Warrenton, Virginia 20186

RE: VINT HILL FARMS STATION – LANDBAY G PP02-CR-07

 $P_H R^+ \Lambda$

Dear Ms. Clark:

Chantilly Bridgewater Leesburg Virginia Beach Woodbridge

We have received your comments dated March 28, 2002 and we offer the following response.

LABORATORY: Chantilly Comment 1:

MARYLAND OFFICES:

The width of Road Section "B" as shown is 50 feet. Traffic studies indicate that a 60 foot width is required. This roadway serves as access to Rogues Road (Route 602) for this future land bays and must meet all standards for such volume. The proposed roadway sections do not reflect input provided by the County Engineer and VDOT focused on resolving roadway design and construction issues.

Frederick Germantown Hollywood

Response 1:

WEST VIRGINIA

Martinsburg

20175

In accordance with our meeting on April 03 it was agreed that a 50 foot Right-of-Way would be acceptable to the County as it meets VDOTS requirements based on anticipated traffic volume provided that the travel lanes are increased to 12 feet in width resulting in a 36 foot face to face of curb dimension. This new dimension is reflected in both the typical road section for roadway B as well as the plan view dimensioning on sheet # 4.

T 800.553.PHRA T 703.777.3616 F 703.777.3725 208 Church St., S.E. Leesburg, VA

Comment 2:

The current design indicates the use of private streets in Land Bay G. Proffered conditions and modifications require that the area be gated if private streets are used. Specific information regarding the gate facility is needed. This includes its location, size and configuration, accommodations for centralized mail delivery and pick-up by residents if required by the postal service, and access requirements for service and emergency vehicles. Clarification regarding pedestrian access to walkways, trails and open space is needed to determine impacts of gated access.

Response 2: The design has been changed to reflect public streets thereby negating the need for a gate and all the associated issues.

Comment 3:

Review of the Amended Traffic Analysis indicates the need for mitigation to address traffic generated by future development. It is recommended that this land bay establish sufficient right-of-way for the right turn lane from Rogues Road (Route 602). Future needs include a left turn lane from Route 602.

Response 3:

A right turn lane has been proposed with this plan including a 12 foot right of way dedication which parallels the 200 foot turn pocket and 100 foot taper. In accordance with our traffic study dated 2/14/02 the peak hour volumes do not indicate a need for a left turn lane from Rogues Road into the site. This was agreed to provided Watson Road is constructed with or prior to the proposed Town Center.

 $P_H R_{\uparrow} \Lambda$

Comment 4:

Proposed emergency access from existing Route 602, between Lots 56 and 57, must be sized to accommodate emergency vehicles as determined by the Department of Emergency Services. Since this should be a gated entrance, information specific to the design and placement of the gate is needed.

Response 4:

In accordance with our meeting on April 03, 2002 it was agreed to eliminate the emergency access to Rogues Road and provide a 2nd point of access through the existing patrol road on site. In the ultimate condition an additional access between landbay G and H will be provided between Wilkes Court and Sutherland Court. Information on the access details and design will be provided on the Construction Plans at final engineering.

Comment 5:

Indicate the right-of-way for the private streets as a separate dedication. The current plan shows public and private streets as one dedication.

Response 5:

This comment is no longer applicable since we have now changed to all public streets.

Comment 6:

Sidewalk and walkway design proffers (Section F, 2) describe a "network that will allow pedestrian access within the site." It is unclear how the proposed design will meet this requirement. No connection is shown from Land Bay G to other land bays. Please note that sidewalks are limited in their usefulness to serve the variety of recreational needs that are better met by trails.

Response 6:

The proposed trail network has been added to sheet # 2 and 4 and combined with having sidewalk on both sides of the streets should more than comply with the proffer requirements.

Ms Deirdre Clark April 10, 2002 Page 3

Comment 7: Clarification is needed to determine the location of the 50 foot wide vegetated buffer as described in Section 1 of the Landscape Standards noted on Sheet 8. Rear boundary lines of lots 6, 7 and 8 are less than 50 feet from Rogues Road (Route 602).

Response 7: The 50 foot buffer has been dimensioned and indicated on the plan. Also all impacted lots have been reconfigured to remove them completely from the limits of the Buffer.

Comment 8: Zoning ordinance waivers, modifications and exceptions allow for a variety of architectural design types, to include zero lot line designs. Side and rear yard setbacks and/or a typical residence design footprint should be included on all lots.

Response 8: The front side and rear setbacks have been shown on sheet #4 with a detail including dimensioning on sheet #7.

Comment 9: A copy of the Homeowner's Association Agreement is needed. Specific information is needed regarding age-restricted ownership and transfer thereof, age limits of residents, street and gate maintenance, snow removal, mail delivery, emergency and service vehicle access, signage, and pedestrian access to walkways and open space.

Response: 9: The proposed HOA documents are being provided under separate cover.

Comment 10: Street names must be indicated on the preliminary plat.

Response 10: Street names have been provided and are shown on Sheet #4.

I have included fifteen folded copies of the plan with all changes for your approval. I hope this addresses your comments and concerns noted in this letter. Should you have any questions concerning these responses, please feel free to call.

Sincerely,

PATTON HARRIS RUST & ASSOCIATES, pc A Professional Corporation

Leel Oameen J.

Fred D. Ameen Jr., P.E. Director of Engineering

P:\Project\10428\5-G\Engrg\Admin\Correspondence\Letters\CommentResponseLandbayGPrelim-041002.doc